

XIII. Capital Facilities

Purpose

The Capital Facilities Element is a six-year plan for fully funded capital improvements that support the City's current and future population and economy. New development is required to be served by adequate facilities. The principal criteria for identifying needed capital improvements are level of service standards (LOS). The Capital Facilities Element contains many of the level of service standards for each public facility. Level of service standards are also in other elements of the comprehensive plan or within functional plans that manage public facilities. The element also contains broad goals and specific policies that guide implementation of adequate public facilities.

The purpose of the Capital Facilities Element is three-fold:

- (1) To establish sound fiscal policies to guide Kirkland in planning for public facilities;
- (2) Identify facilities needed to support growth and development consistent with the policies of the Comprehensive Plan; and
- (3) Establish adopted standards for levels of service.

Vision

The Capital Facilities element supports the provision of adequate public facilities and services in a timely, coordinated, efficient, and cost-effective manner that meets the needs of a growing population. The goals and policies of this element ensures that Kirkland provides high-quality public facilities that are equitably accessed, advances public health and safety, protects the environment, and meets the needs of current and future generations.

What is a capital facility or capital improvement project?

Capital improvements include: the construction of new facilities; the expansion, large-scale renovation, or replacement of existing facilities; and the acquisition of land or the purchase of major pieces of equipment, including major replacements funded by the equipment rental fund or those that are associated with newly acquired facilities.

A capital improvement must meet all of the following criteria:

- It is an expenditure that can be classified as a fixed asset.
- It has an estimated cost of \$50,000 or more (with the exception of land).
- It has a useful life span of 10 years or more (with the exception of certain equipment which may have a short life span)



Fire Station 24

Why plan for capital facilities?

Growth Management

Capital facilities plans are required in the Comprehensive Plan in order to:

- Provide capital facilities for land development that is envisioned or authorized by the Land Use Element of the Comprehensive Plan.
- Maintain the quality of life for the community by establishing and maintaining level of service standards for capital facilities.
- Coordinate and provide consistency among the many plans for capital improvements, including other elements of the Comprehensive Plan, strategic plans, functional plans, and other studies of the local government, plans for capital facilities of State and/or regional significance, plans of other adjacent local governments, and plans of special districts.
- Ensure the timely provision of adequate facilities as required in the GMA.
- Document all capital projects and their financing.

The Capital Facilities Element is the element that guides the City in the construction of its physical improvements. By establishing levels of service as the basis for providing capital facilities and for achieving concurrency, the Element determines the quality of improvements in the community. The requirement to fully finance the Capital Facilities Plan (or revise the Land Use Plan) provides the basis for financing the vision of the Plan.

Good Management

Planning for major capital facilities and their costs enables the City to:

- (a) Identify the need for facilities and funding sources to pay for facilities;
- (b) Estimate eventual operation and maintenance costs of new capital facilities that impact budgets;
- (c) Take advantage of sources of revenue; and
- (d) Improve ratings on bond issues when the City borrows money for capital facilities that reduces interest rates and the cost of borrowing money.

Capital Facilities Element vs. Capital Improvement Program

The Capital Facilities Element contains goals and policies to guide construction of capital improvements to provide new capacity to accommodate growth and ensure that the City's existing infrastructure is maintained over the 20-year planning horizon. The Capital Facilities Element also contains the Capital Facilities Plan (CFP) that consists of capital projects needed to maintain the adopted level of service standards. The goals and policies in the Capital Facilities Element establish the need for the projects in the CFP.

The City's Capital Improvement Program (CIP) addresses construction and acquisition of major capital facilities over a six-year timeframe. Similar to the CFP, the CIP includes projects that provide new capacity to maintain level of service standards. The CIP also includes maintenance, repair, and replacement projects that do not add new capacity but preserve existing infrastructure. The CIP contains both funded and unfunded projects. The Capital Facilities Element, on the other hand, must be balanced all projects must have an identified funding source.

Capital Facilities Element vs. Neighborhood Plans

Many of the neighborhood plans identify desired pedestrian, bicycle and park improvements that reflect the interests of community members in those neighborhoods. These improvements are a result of the public process in developing the plans. Some improvements may be completed with land use development through grants, or through other programs. All transportation related capital projects are included in the Transportation Strategic Plan (TSP) project list, which is a prioritized list of all transportation needs in the city. Some projects may lack funding sources in the foreseeable future. As projects are prioritized for the CFP and CIP, consideration should be given to funding these desired improvements where appropriate and feasible.

Explanation of Levels of Service

Levels of service (LOS) are usually quantifiable measures of the number, size, and extent of public facilities that are provided to the community. Levels of service may also measure the quality of some public facilities. The measurement of level of service varies by the type of facility and may be changed if the City chooses to take a different approach to the way that LOS is measured. Examples of measurements are response time for fire and

emergency service, and gallons per day to each customer for water and sewer.

Setting the Standards for Levels of Service

The GMA requires the CFP to be based on standards for service levels LOS standards that are measurable and financially feasible. LOS standards are measures of the quality of life of the community. The standards should be based on the community's vision of its future and its values.

Community values and desires change and evolve, and funding levels fluctuate; therefore, adjustments to level of service standards will be required over time. The challenge is to balance the need for reliability on timely completion of improvements with being responsive to changing conditions. In addition to the level of service standards, the Vision Statement, Guiding Principles and other goals and policies in the Comprehensive Plan should also be considered when making decisions on capital improvement projects and facilities.

What is concurrency?

The concurrency requirement in the Growth Management Act mandates that capital facilities be coordinated with new development or redevelopment. Kirkland's concurrency ordinance fulfills this requirement. The City has determined that roads, water and sewer facilities must be available concurrent with new development or redevelopment. This means that adequate capital facilities must be finished and in place before, at the time, or within a reasonable time period following the impacts of development. For water and sewer, adequate capital facilities are those facilities which have the capacity to serve the development without decreasing the adopted levels of service for the community below accepted standards. For discussion on transportation level of service and concurrency management, refer to the Transportation Element.

For water and sewer, concurrency is determined by comparing the available capacity of water and sewer facilities to the capacity to be used by new development. Capacity is determined by the City's adopted LOS standards. If the available capacity is equal to or greater than the capacity to be used by new development, then concurrency is met. If the available capacity is less than the capacity to be used by new development, then concurrency is not met. For roads, concurrency measures the balance between new growth and construction of the transportation network for each mode over the course of a 20-year period. Policy CF-6.2 below addresses what options are available to the developer and/or by the City if concurrency is not met.

Meeting concurrency requires a balancing of public and private expenditures. Private costs are generally limited to the services directly related to a particular development. The City is responsible for maintaining adequate system capacity that will meet adopted LOS standards.

Relationship to Other Elements

The Capital Facilities Plan of this element ensures that the public facilities needed to support many of the goals and policies in the other elements are programmed for implementation. Level of service standards for capital facilities are derived from the growth projections contained within the Land Use Element. The Land Use Element also calls for phasing increases in residential and commercial intensities to correspond with the availability of public facilities necessary to support new growth. The Capital Facilities Element also ensures that the residential development identified in the Housing Element is supported by adequate improvements.

The Capital Facilities Element is also supported by the Transportation Element, Sustainability, Climate, and Environment Element, Utilities Element, Public Services Element, and Parks, Recreation and Open Space Element. Each of these supporting elements provides the policy direction for the level of service standards,

project lists, and funding plan to pay for and construct the physical improvements identified in this chapter.

Capital Facilities Goals and Policies

Capital Facilities for Quality of Life

One of the basic premises of this Element is that the provision of public facilities contributes to our quality of life. Fire stations, roads, bicycle and pedestrian systems, parks, and other facilities are a physical reflection of community values. The challenge is in keeping up with the demands for new or enhanced facilities as growth occurs or as needs change.

Goal CF-1: Contribute to the quality of life in Kirkland for both current and future generations through the planned provision of, and equitable access to, public capital facilities and utilities.

Policy CF-1.1: Determine needed capital facilities and utilities based on adopted level of service and forecasts of growth in accordance with the Land Use Element.

Levels of service are measurements of the quantity and quality of public facilities provided to the community. By comparing the inventory of existing facilities to the amount required to achieve and maintain the level of service standard, the needs for capital facilities can be determined.

Policy CF-1.2: Design public facilities to be sensitive in scale and design with surrounding uses and enhance a sense of community.

A high priority for Kirkland community members is maintaining and enhancing Kirkland's strong sense of community. To achieve this, it is important that public facilities are compatible in building height, bulk, and materials with adjacent uses.



Totem Lake Connector Bridge

Policy CF-1.3: Provide affordable and equitable access to public services to all communities, especially the historically underserved. Prioritize investments to address disparities.

The health of the city's community members depends on whether they have fair and timely access to high-quality, affordable, and conveniently located public services and facilities. Equitable access to these services and facilities will require identifying gaps in services and planning for expanded or improved services and facilities, which requires thoughtful planning and investment.

Policy CF-1.4: Encourage public amenities and facilities which serve as catalysts for beneficial development.

To promote a sustainable and resilient economy, certain public facilities, such as parks, utility lines, bicycle networks, pedestrian walkways, and roads add to the economic viability of surrounding private development. By providing these improvements, the City creates an environment which attracts desirable economic activities and supports the business community.

Policy CF-1.5: Protect and enhance public health and environmental quality through the appropriate location, design, and construction of public facilities and through responsible maintenance and operating procedures.

Another high priority for Kirkland community members is protecting the environment. By designing, installing, and maintaining public facilities that are protective of the natural and built environment, the City can take leadership in preserving the natural systems and features and maintaining the urban tree and vegetation canopy in Kirkland.

Policy CF-1.6: Consider climate change, economic, equity, and public health impacts when siting, and building and operating essential public services and facilities.

While essential to growth and development, capital facilities can disproportionately affect the public health and environmental quality of the communities in which they are located. It is important that the city address health inequity and environmental justice when siting and operating facilities to foster the development of healthy and environmentally sustainable communities for all.

Policy CF-1.7: Establish new or expanded sites for public facilities, utilities, and infrastructure in a manner that ensures disaster resiliency, public service recovery, and climate change impacts.

Community resilience is the ability to prepare for anticipated hazards, adapt to changing conditions, and withstand and recover rapidly from disruptions. The City is committed to mitigating and reducing risk for its businesses and communities it serves. Strategic planning in new and expanded sites for public facilities, utilities, and infrastructure will mitigate risk and build community resilience.

Goal CF-2: Implement sustainable development principles with the design, construction, maintenance, and operation of public facilities.

Policy CF-2.1: Promote conservation of energy, water, and other natural resources and reduce waste in the location, design of public facilities and utilities using a variety of techniques, including low impact development, renewable energy, and other sustainable development practices.

Through the location, design and operation of public facilities and utilities, the City can conserve energy, water, and other natural resources, minimize impacts to the natural and built environment and reduce waste. The City can be cost-effective with its public facilities by establishing conservation programs in City buildings for energy consumption, materials equipment usage, and constructing buildings based on sustainable development practices. The practices include integrated building and site design, reduced impervious surface, use of renewable energy, reused waste water for irrigation, and landscaping used to reduce heat emissions and filter surface runoff. Other measures can be taken, such as increasing energy efficiency in street lights and signals, incorporating sustainable measures into roads, sewer and stormwater projects, and maintaining facilities. See the Built Environment section in the Sustainability, Climate, and Environment Element for additional goals and policies on sustainable practices for public facilities.

Policy CF-2.2: Use lifecycle planning and embodied carbon analysis to determine the most cost-effective low carbon facility design and construction strategies over the lifetime of a public facility.

Life Cycle Cost Analysis (LCCA) is a process of evaluating the economic cost of a facility over its lifetime. LCCA balances the initial monetary investment with the long-term cost of owning, operating, and maintaining a facility. LCCA analysis looks at the trade-offs between low initial costs and long-term cost savings, determines the most cost-efficient facility design and construction strategies, and calculates how long it will take for a specific design to pay back its incremental cost. The cumulative cost of operating and maintaining facilities is considered in the LCCA analysis. Over the long run, LCCA analysis would reduce total cost of facility ownership resulting in a cost savings to the City.

Understanding the impacts that climate change will have on future conditions and infrastructure is an important part of planning for public services. A means of addressing the climate impacts of the city's public services is to reduce their embodied carbon. Embodied carbon represents the carbon emissions released during the lifecycle

of building materials, including extraction, manufacturing, transport, construction, and disposal, and is calculated as global warming potential (GWP) and expressed in carbon dioxide equivalent units (CO₂e). Reducing embodied carbon from construction materials is essential to effectively addressing climate change.

The City should include both LCCA and embodied carbon analysis when planning for and managing existing public facilities to reduce costs and manage climate change impacts throughout their lifecycle.

Policy CF-2.3: Reduce the rate of energy consumption in public facilities through efficiency and conservation as a means to lower energy costs and mitigate environmental impacts associated with traditional energy supplies.

Climate change and Washington's shift towards clean energy is already having an impact on energy demands in our region. Kirkland should employ energy efficiency and conservation strategies in the design and operation of its public facilities. Energy efficiency in facilities can help cut carbon emissions and build resiliency in the City's capital investments.

Policy CF-2.4: Invest in and promote the use of low-carbon, renewable, and alternative clean energy resources to help meet the city's long-term energy needs, reduce environmental impacts associated with traditional energy supplies, and increase community sustainability.

Using more efficient designs and technologies can reduce some of the need for new infrastructure. A commitment to sustainable infrastructure ensures the least possible strain on the City's resources and the environment, while contributing to healthy and prosperous communities.

Policy CF-2.5: Invest in cost-effective, environmentally sustainable, and proactive plans to maintain and replace critical City and facility infrastructure.

Sustainable capital improvement plans should be developed to maintain aging City infrastructure. An emphasis should be placed on what is critical to maintain reliable, resilient public services consistent with the City's sustainability and electrification goals.

Response to Growth

The Growth Management Act (GMA) requires that the City accommodate its fair share of the forecasted regional growth and, at the same time, provide and maintain acceptable level of service standards that are financially feasible. The GMA also requires that the City ensure the public facilities and services necessary to support development are available for occupancy and use without decreasing the adopted level of service standards.

Goal CF-3: Provide a variety of responses to the demands of growth on capital facilities and utilities.

Policy CF-3.1: Concentrate land use patterns to encourage efficient use of transportation, water, sewer and surface water management facilities and solid waste, police, and fire protection services in order to reduce the need to expand facilities and services.

Land use patterns, including intensity, location, type and mix of uses, affect the demands on all public facilities and the levels of service provided to each neighborhood. One example is encouraging new development or redevelopment where public facilities already exist which may alleviate the need for constructing new facilities.

Policy CF-3.2: Provide additional public facility capacity consistent with available funding when existing facilities are used to their maximum level of efficiency.

Before additional facilities are built, existing facilities should be used to the maximum extent possible by efficient operations and demand management. When increased capacity is warranted, costly retrofits should be avoided by incorporating all improvements up front.

Policy CF-3.3: If all other responses to growth fail, then restrict the amount and/or location of new development in order to preserve the level of service of public facilities and utilities.

The GMA provides that funding and LOS standards can be adjusted to accommodate new development or redevelopment and still meet the concurrency test (see discussion in the Introduction, “What is concurrency?” in this Element). However, if these adjustments are unacceptable, then the amount, location, or phasing of new development should be restricted until such a time that concurrency can be met.

Level of Service Standards and Concurrent Provision of Adequate Public Facilities

Level of service standards are the benchmark the City uses to determine the adequacy of public facilities to serve existing and new development. The City may choose the level of service standards it desires, but they must be achievable with existing facilities plus any additional capital improvement projects identified in the Comprehensive Plan.

Goal CF-4: Identify level of service standards that ensure adequate public facilities to serve existing and future development.

The Capital Facilities Plan includes project lists and a financing plan to assure that adequate public facilities can be provided concurrent with their demands. The City must ensure that the improvements are made in a timely manner so as to not jeopardize concurrency requirements. One of the basic goals of GMA is to ensure that growth does not outpace the demand for public facilities. In that sense, the community is assured that its infrastructure needs are met when development occurs.

Sewer and Water Facilities

Water and sewer facilities are essential to public health. Therefore, they must be available and adequate upon first use of development.



Culvert Construction

Policy CF-4.1: Use the following level of service standards for determining the need for public sewer and water facilities:

Table CF-1

Sewer and Water Level of Service

| Facility | Standard |
|---------------------------|--|
| Water distribution | Water distribution, supply, pumping, and storage capacity per the City's current Water Systems Plan to provide safe and reliable drinking water for domestic, commercial, irrigation, and fire suppression uses. |
| Sanitary sewer collection | Collection and pumping capacity per the City's current General Sewer Plan for conveyance to regional wastewater treatment facilities to protect public |

| | |
|--|-----------------------------|
| | health and the environment. |
|--|-----------------------------|

Sewer and water facilities are essential to the protection and enhancement of public health and thus are tied directly to concurrency requirements. While the City does not provide the source for water, nor the treatment for sewer, level of service standards are used to determine the capacity of facilities to accommodate growth at the local and regional levels.

Transportation Facilities

The GMA permits up to six years to achieve standards for transportation facilities after new development is completed. Level of service standards for each mode in the Transportation Strategic Plan primarily address completeness of various aspects of the transportation network, in order to complement the concurrency system and to directly measure standards for which the City has control. Therefore, the City uses the term “level of completion” in place of “level of service” when referring to the actual measure. The level of completion choices made for each mode are aligned with the proposed 20-year network project list as shown in the table below. Time is the basis for evaluating the level of completion. Level of completion measures the rate of project completion over the course of the 20-year period. See Transportation Element for more on transportation Level of Service standards.

Other Public Facilities

The “concurrency” requirement does not apply to the facilities listed in Table CF-3. New development will not be denied based on the standard found in Table CF-3. However, mitigation, impact fees, or other developer contributions may be required to meet the standards for the public facilities found in Table CF-3 for level of service.

Policy CF-4.3: Use the following level of service standards to determine the need for public facilities:

Table CF-3

Six-Year Public Facilities Level of Service for Surface Water Management, Fire and Emergency Medical Services (EMS), and Parks

| Facility | Standard |
|--------------------------|---|
| Surface water management | Conveyance, flow control, and water quality treatment per the Stormwater Management Manual for Western Washington or equivalent to prevent flooding, and protect water quality and habitat in streams and lakes |
| Fire and EMS | Total response times (includes dispatch time, turnout time, and travel time): Emergency medical: 6 minutes to 90% of emergency all-incidents Fire suppression: 6 minutes, 20 seconds to 90% of all fire |

| | |
|-------|--|
| | incidents |
| Parks | See the Parks, Recreation, and Open Space (PROS) Plan for current level of service standards and guidelines. |

Although the above level of service standards are not tied directly to concurrency requirements, they are important to the City's functioning and the City should strive to meet or exceed them. The LOS standards identified here are one factor to consider when making decisions on these types of capital projects. Other factors which should be considered are community goals and values, system connections, such as trails, sidewalks, and pathways, and location and proximity to population served.

Policy CF-4.4: Provide, or arrange for others to provide, the capital improvements listed in this Capital Facilities Plan needed to achieve and maintain standards adopted in this Plan.

While the City is responsible for its Capital Improvement Program, in many cases, capital facilities are provided by others – such as the State, developers, or special districts. The City should coordinate the provision of these facilities in order to ensure that the levels of service identified in the plan can be achieved.

Concurrency

Goal CF-5: Ensure that water, sewer, and transportation facilities necessary to support new development are available and adequate, and concurrent with new development, based on the City's adopted level of service standards.

Policy CF-5.1: Monitor the levels of service for water, sewer and transportation facilities and ensure that new development does not cause levels of service to decline below the adopted standards.

The City shall evaluate the capacity needs of new development against existing or planned capacity to ensure that the adopted levels of service are maintained for water, sewer, and transportation.

Policy CF-5.2: Ensure levels of service for water and sewer are adequate no later than occupancy and use of new development.

Water and sewer facilities are essential to public health, therefore they must be available and adequate upon first use of development.

Policy CF-5.3: Ensure levels of service for road facilities are met no later than six years after occupancy and use of new development.

The GMA allows up to six years to achieve standards for transportation facilities because they do not threaten public health, are very expensive, and are built in large "increments."

Concurrency is a benchmark for determining the extent to which new development must address the impacts that it creates on selected facilities: water, sewer and roads. If concurrency is not met, several options or a combination thereof are available to meet concurrency:

- (a) Improve the public facilities to maintain the levels of service; or
- (b) Revise the proposed development to reduce impacts to maintain satisfactory levels of service; or
- (c) Phase the development to coincide with the availability of increased water, sewer, and transportation facilities.

Funding and Financial Feasibility

Financial feasibility is required for capital improvements by the GMA. Estimates for funding should be conservative and realistic based on the City's historical track record. Financial commitments should be bankable or bondable. Voter-approved revenue, such as bonds, may be used, but adjustments must

be made if the revenue is not approved. Adjustments can include substituting a different source of revenue, reducing the level of service, and/or reducing the demand for public facilities.

In addition, facilities should not be built if the provider cannot afford to operate and maintain them or to arrange for another entity to operate and maintain the facilities.

Goal CF-6: Provide needed public facilities that are within the ability of the City to fund or within the City's authority to require others to provide.

Policy CF-6.1: Base the Capital Facilities Plan on conservative estimates of current local revenues and external revenues that are reasonably anticipated to be received by the City.

Financial feasibility is required for capital improvements, and "financial commitments" are required for transportation improvements. Estimates for funding should be conservative and realistic based on the City's historical track record. The forecasts need not be the most pessimistic estimate, but should not exceed the most likely estimate. "Financial commitments" should be bankable or bondable.

Policy CF-6.2: Consider adjustments to the adopted levels of service, land use plan and/or revenue sources if funding is not available to finance capacity projects for capital facilities and utilities.

If projected funding is inadequate to finance needed capital facilities and utilities based on adopted level of service standards and forecasted growth, the City should make adjustments to one or more of the following areas: level of service, Land Use Element, sources of revenue, and/or the timing of projects.

If new development would cause levels of service to decline, the City may allow future development to use existing facilities (thus reducing levels of service), or reduce future development (in order to preserve levels of service), or increase revenue (in order to purchase facility level of service to match future development). Naturally, the City can use a combination of these three strategies.

Policy CF-6.3: Use a variety of funding sources to finance facilities in the Capital Facilities Plan.

The City's first choice for financing future capital improvements is to continue using existing sources of revenue that are already available and being used for capital facilities. These sources may include gas tax, business licenses, utility connection charges, utility rates, roads and park levies, reserves, general funds, real estate excise tax, interest income, debt, impact fee for roads and parks, grants and infrastructure financing programs. Use of real estate taxes (REET 1 and REET 2) have specific limits in State law that must be considered as part of the City's overall funding strategy.

If these sources are inadequate, the City will need to explore the feasibility of additional revenues. Impact fees are subject to a number of limitations in State law:

- Impact fees are authorized only for parks, fire protection, and schools. Impact fees are also authorized for roads, multimodal trails, lanes, paths, or sidewalks that are publicly owned or within the public right-of-way and connects two or more destinations.
- There must be a balance between impact fees and other sources of public funds; the City cannot rely solely on impact fees.
- Impact fees can only be imposed for system improvements which:
 - (a) Reasonably relate to the new development;
 - (b) Do not exceed a proportionate share of the costs related to the new development;
 - (c) Are used to reasonably benefit the new development; and
 - (d) Are not for existing deficiencies.
- Impact fee rates must be adjusted to reflect the payment of other taxes, fees, and charges by the development that are used for the same system improvements as the impact fee.
- Impact fees may serve in lieu of some of the facilities required to be provided by developers.

Policy CF-6.4: Utilize the surface water utility to fund projects needed to meet established level of service standards.

One method for financing surface water management is a utility-based service charge. Municipal surface water utilities are established under Chapter [35.67](#) RCW and are funded through a monthly service charge. Rates are based on a charge per equivalent residential unit or on impervious area for commercial and industrial properties.

Policy CF-6.5: Match revenue sources to capital projects on the basis of sound fiscal policies.

Sound fiscal policies include (a) cost effectiveness, (b) prudent asset and liability management, (c) limits to the length of financing to the useful life of the project, (d) efficient use of the City's borrowing capacity, and (e) maximizing use of grants and other nonlocal revenues.

Policy CF-6.6: Arrange for alternative financial commitments in the event that revenues needed for concurrency are not received from other sources.

The concurrency facilities (water, sewer, and transportation) must be built, or else desirable development that is allowed in the Comprehensive Plan may be denied. If the City's other financing plans for these facilities do not succeed, the City must provide a financial safety net for these facilities. One source of funding that is available at the discretion of the City Council is councilmanic bonds or revenue bonds (for utilities). The only disadvantage of these bonds is that their repayment is from existing revenues (that are currently used for other purposes which will be underfunded by the diversion to repayment of councilmanic bonds).

Policy CF-6.7: Revise the financing plan in the event that revenue sources that require voter approval in a referendum are not approved.

The financing plan can use revenues that are subject to voter approval, such as bonds, but the plan must be adjusted if the revenue is not approved. Adjustments can include substituting a different source of revenue, reducing the level of service, and/or reducing the demand for public facilities.

Policy CF-6.8: Ensure that the ongoing operating and maintenance costs of a capital facility are financially feasible prior to constructing the facility.

Facilities should not be built if the provider cannot afford to operate and maintain them.

Policy CF-6.9: Ensure that new development pays a proportionate share of the cost of new facilities needed to serve such development, including transportation facilities, parks, fire and EMS, or the extension of water and sewer lines as needed to serve the development proposal.

New development should contribute its proportionate share of the cost of facilities needed by the development. The contribution may be in the form of installing the improvements (i.e., extension of utility lines), a contractual agreement to contribute towards the installation of the facilities upon determination of need by the City, or in cash.

Policy CF-6.10: Where appropriate, the City may use local improvement districts, Transportation Benefit Districts, Tax Increment Financing (TIF), or latecomer fees to facilitate the installation of public facilities needed to service new development.

Some new development may be able to fulfill its obligation by creating a special district. Others may be required to build or pay for entire facilities, such as a new road, to serve their development, but they may recoup some of the cost from other subsequent development through “latecomer” agreements that use the excess capacity created by the new public facility. The City may also choose to employ financing tools such as TIF to fund public infrastructure in targeted areas and encourage private development and investment in those areas.

Policy CF-6.11: Where appropriate, the City may use infrastructure financing programs to fund capital improvements in areas designated for growth.

When partnering with King County on regional Transfer Development Rights (TDR) efforts, the City may require King County to provide funding for capital projects in neighborhoods accepting increased development capacity through TDR, such as transportation and park improvements.

Consistency with Other Plans

Many of Kirkland’s public facilities and utilities are integrally connected with other local and regional systems, such as water, sewer, surface water management, roads, and fire and emergency management. In addition, parts of Kirkland receive water and sewer service from separate utility districts.

The Growth Management Act requires close coordination among local, regional, and State plans and programs. This requirement assumes that each jurisdiction is part of a larger whole and that the actions of one affect and are affected by the actions of other jurisdictions.

Goal CF-7: Ensure that the Capital Facilities Element is consistent with other City, local, regional, and State adopted plans and supports local and regional growth planning objectives.

The following documents have been reviewed and taken into consideration during the development of the Capital

Facilities Element. These are considered to be “functional or management plans.” They are intended to be more detailed, often noting technical specifications and standards. They are designed to be an implementation tool rather than a policy-guiding document.

Table CF-4

Functional and Management Plans

| |
|---|
| City of Kirkland Fire Strategic Plan |
| City of Kirkland Water System Plan |
| City of Kirkland General Sewer Plan |
| City of Kirkland Capital Improvement Programs |
| City of Kirkland Surface Water Strategic Plan |
| City of Kirkland Transportation Strategic Plan |
| City of Kirkland Active Transportation Plan |
| Totem Lake Urban Center Enhancement and Multimodal Transportation Network Plan (R-5316) |
| Sustainability Strategic Plan |
| City of Kirkland Commute Trip Reduction Basic Plan |
| City of Kirkland Natural Resource Management Plan |
| City of Kirkland Natural Resource Management Plan |
| City of Kirkland Urban Forestry Strategic Management Plan |
| City of Kirkland Parks, Recreation and Open Space Plan |
| City of Kirkland Downtown Strategic Plan |
| City of Kirkland Housing Strategy Plan |
| City of Kirkland Climate Protection Action Plan |
| City of Kirkland Shoreline Master Program |
| City of Kirkland Smart City Strategic Plan |
| King County Solid Waste Division Comprehensive Solid Waste Management Plan |
| Northshore Utility District Comprehensive Water System Plan |
| Northshore Utility District Wastewater System Plan |
| Woodinville Water District Comprehensive Water System Plan |
| Lake Washington School District Capital Facilities Plan |

Policy CF-7.1: Time and phase services and facilities to guide growth and development in a manner that supports the Regional Growth Strategy.

Coordinated planning between Puget Sound Regional Council (PSRC), King County, Kirkland, and service

providers help make public facilities more efficient, affordable, effective, sustainable, and equitable.

Policy CF-7.2: In the event of any inconsistency between the City's Comprehensive Plan and a functional or management plan, the Comprehensive Plan will take precedence.

As required under the Growth Management Act, the Comprehensive Plan is the overall plan to which all other functional plans must be consistent. Table CF-4 lists the City's major functional and management plans. As functional and management plans are updated, they may result in proposed revisions to the Comprehensive Plan.

Policy CF-7.3: Reassess the Comprehensive Plan annually to ensure that capital facilities needs and utilities needs, financing and level of service are consistent, and that the plan is internally consistent.

The Growth Management Act requires that the Comprehensive Plan be reviewed on an annual basis to determine if the adopted level of service standards are still appropriate, if the capital facilities and utilities needs are being met, and if the financing plan is balanced. Also, the Capital Facilities Element must be revised as necessary to ensure consistency with other Plan elements.

Policy CF-7.4: Coordinate with non-City providers of public facilities on a joint program for maintaining adopted levels of service standards, concurrency requirements, funding, and construction of shared public facilities.

To assure that all Kirkland community members are provided comparable levels of service, the City should work with the non-City providers to agree on LOS standards, to implement and fund programs to meet those LOS standards, and establish consistent concurrency requirements.

Policy CF-7.5: Ensure the efficient and equitable siting of essential regional capital facilities through cooperative and coordinated planning with other jurisdictions within the region.

As required by the Growth Management Act, the City must facilitate the siting of essential regional facilities that need to locate in Kirkland. In Goal LU-8 and its related policies under the Land Use Element, the City sets forth criteria and processes for siting of regional facilities.

Capital Facilities Plan

Introduction

The following Tables CF-5 through CF-10 list the capital improvement projects for the six-year planning period for transportation, utilities, parks, public safety and facilities. An additional multi-year list of transportation projects is also provided beyond the six-year planning period. In each table, a number of funding sources are identified.

The cost of each capital improvement project is shown in real dollars with expected inflation according to project category applied in future years.

Most of the funded projects for transportation and utilities are needed to meet the adopted LOS standards for concurrency. In addition, many of the capital improvement projects listed will meet the adopted LOS standards, eliminate existing deficiencies, and make available adequate facilities for future growth.

Projects

Funded Projects – Transportation, Utilities, Stormwater, Parks, Public Safety and Facilities

Tables CF-5 through CF-10 contain a list of funded capital improvements along with a financing plan. Specific funding sources and amounts of revenue are shown which will be used to pay for the proposed funded capital projects. The funding sources for the funded projects are a reflection of the policy direction within the text of this Element.

The revenue forecasts and needed capital projects are based on the Capital Improvement Program. When the Capital Improvement Program (CIP) is updated, the projects within the Capital Facilities Plan should be changed to match the CIP document.

Transportation projects are found in Table CF-5. The table includes pedestrian, bicycle, street and traffic intersection improvements. Transportation grants require matching City funds so the City should provide the funds from the funding sources found in Policy CF-6.3. As priorities change and/or projects on Table CF-5 are completed, projects from the multi-year list will be moved to the funded section of the table.

Utility, parks, and public safety projects are listed below:

- Tables CF-6 and CF-7 contain water, sewer and surface water utility projects with all projects being funded.
- Table CF-8 contains park projects with all projects as fully funded, including several of those funded with voter-approved bonds.
- Table CF-9 contains public safety projects with all projects being funded.
- Table CF-10 contains public facility projects with all projects being funded.

Note: Tables 5 -10 below shall be amended for consistency with the 2023-2028 Capital Improvement Program (CIP) and 2025-2026 budget and brought to a public hearing before the Planning Commission later in 2024.

Table CF - 5
Capital Facilities Plan: Transportation Projects -- 2023-2035

SOURCES OF FUNDS

(Updated 11-30-23)

| Revenue Type | Revenue Source | 2023 | 2024 | 2025 | 2026 | 2027 | 2028 | Six-Year Total | 2029 - 2035 |
|---------------------------------|---|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|----------------|-------------|
| Local | Gas Tax | 565,000 | 582,000 | 599,000 | 617,000 | 636,000 | 655,000 | 3,654,000 | 4,589,000 |
| Local | Gas Tax (Transportation Package) | 225,000 | 200,000 | 225,000 | 200,000 | 225,000 | 200,000 | 1,275,000 | 1,711,000 |
| Local | Revenue Generating Regulatory License | 270,000 | 270,000 | 270,000 | 270,000 | 270,000 | 270,000 | 1,620,000 | 2,310,000 |
| Local | Real Estate Excise Tax 1 (REET 1) | 1,917,680 | 1,872,500 | 1,887,875 | 1,481,000 | 2,130,000 | 1,487,913 | 10,776,968 | 10,694,000 |
| Local | Real Estate Excise Tax 2 (REET 2) | 3,336,500 | 3,277,995 | 3,327,517 | 3,084,448 | 3,463,474 | 1,092,087 | 17,582,021 | 10,694,000 |
| Local | Street Levy | 2,788,000 | 2,858,000 | 2,929,000 | 3,002,000 | 3,077,000 | 3,154,000 | 17,808,000 | 22,094,000 |
| Local | Solid Waste | 401,000 | 415,000 | 430,000 | 445,000 | 461,000 | 477,000 | 2,629,000 | 2,567,000 |
| Local | Surface Water | 460,000 | 500,000 | 500,000 | 500,000 | 500,000 | 200,000 | 2,660,000 | 4,278,000 |
| Local | Impact Fees | 2,000,000 | 2,000,000 | 1,900,000 | | | | 5,900,000 | 8,556,000 |
| External | Fee-in-Lieu | 183,273 | | | | | | 183,273 | - |
| Local | General Fund | 68,613 | | | | | | 68,613 | - |
| Local | Intrafund Project Transfers | 687,076 | 500,000 | 1,200,000 | | | | 2,387,076 | - |
| Local | REET 1 Reserves | 4,043,380 | | | | | | 4,043,380 | - |
| Local | REET 2 Reserves | 8,708,380 | | | | | | 8,708,380 | - |
| Local | Debt | | 21,000,000 | | | | | 21,000,000 | - |
| External | Unsecured Grants & External | | 1,566,500 | 2,872,000 | 7,000,000 | 714,000 | | 12,152,500 | 27,242,000 |
| External | Secured Grants | 12,600,393 | 765,000 | | | | | 13,365,393 | - |
| Undetermined | Funded Through NE 85th Station Area Plan Mechanisms | | | 2,260,984 | | 3,997,664 | 15,042,375 | 21,301,023 | - |
| External | Developer (SAP) | | | 14,326,852 | | 2,509,471 | | 16,836,323 | - |
| Local | School Zone Safety Camera Reserve | 1,500,000 | 1,500,000 | | | | | 3,000,000 | - |
| Subtotal 2023-2028 Fund Sources | | 39,754,295 | 37,306,995 | 32,728,228 | 16,599,448 | 17,983,609 | 22,578,375 | 166,950,950 | 94,735,000 |
| Total Sources | | 39,754,295 | 37,306,995 | 32,728,228 | 16,599,448 | 17,983,609 | 22,578,375 | 166,950,950 | 94,735,000 |
| Total 2023 - 2035 Revenue | | | | | | | | 261,685,950 | |

Use of Funds

| Transportation Capital Facilities Plan 2023-2035 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|---|-------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|-------------------------------|------------------------|--|
| CIP Project Number | Project Title | Included in Impact Fee calculation? | Capacity project for concurrency? | Funded in CIP | | | | | | Six-Year Funded CIP 2023-2028 | 2029-2035 CIP Projects | Candidate Projects for Unanticipated Revenue |
| | | | | 2023 | 2024 | 2025 | 2026 | 2027 | 2028 | | | |
| STC 00600 | Annual Street Preservation Program | No - maintenance | No - maintenance | \$ 1,700,000 | \$ 1,700,000 | \$ 1,700,000 | \$ 1,700,000 | \$ 1,700,000 | \$ 1,700,000 | \$ 10,200,000 | \$ 11,900,000 | |
| STC 00601 | 120th Ave NE Roadway Rehabilitation | No - maintenance | No - maintenance | \$ 500,000 | \$ 500,000 | \$ 1,200,000 | | | | \$ 1,700,000 | | |
| STC 00603 | Street Levy Street Preservation | No - maintenance | No - maintenance | \$ 2,488,000 | \$ 2,558,000 | \$ 2,629,000 | \$ 2,702,000 | \$ 2,777,000 | \$ 2,854,000 | \$ 16,008,000 | \$ 22,321,000 | |
| STC 00605 | Totem Lake Roadway Repair | No - maintenance | No - maintenance | \$ 22,000 | | | | | | \$ 22,000 | | |
| STC 00608 | Local Road Maintenance | No - maintenance | No - maintenance | \$ 50,000 | \$ 50,000 | \$ 50,000 | \$ 50,000 | \$ 50,000 | \$ 50,000 | \$ 300,000 | \$ 350,000 | |
| STC 05913 | 124th Ave NE Roadway Improvements (North Section) Construction | Yes R24 | Yes | \$ 4,250,000 | | | | | | \$ 4,250,000 | | |
| STC 08000 | Annual Striping Program | No - maintenance | No - maintenance | \$ 1,094,613 | \$ 750,000 | \$ 750,000 | \$ 750,000 | \$ 750,000 | \$ 750,000 | \$ 4,754,613 | \$ 5,250,000 | |
| STC 08311 | 100th Avenue NE Roadway Improvements - Design | Yes R10 | Yes | \$ 71,234 | | | | | | \$ 71,234 | | |
| STC 08313 | 100th Avenue NE Roadway Improvements (North Section) | Yes R10 | Yes | \$ 3,202,503 | | | | | | \$ 3,202,503 | | |
| STC 08314 | 100th Avenue NE Roadway Improvements (Mid-North Section) | Yes R10 | Yes | \$ 3,522,187 | | | | | | \$ 3,522,187 | | |
| STC 08900 | Juanita Drive Intersection and Safety Improvements | Yes R12 | Yes | \$ 1,685,113 | \$ 2,150,540 | | | | | \$ 3,835,653 | | |
| STC 10700 | NE 85th Street Ped/Bike Connection 114th Ave NE to 6th St | Yes | Yes | \$ 6,170,076 | | | | | | \$ 6,170,076 | | |
| STC 10800 | NE 85th St and 6th St Westbound Transit Queue Jump | Yes | Yes | \$ 380,000 | | | | | | \$ 380,000 | | |
| STC 10900 | NE 85th Street Eastbound Third Lane 120th Ave NE to 122nd Ave NE | Yes | Yes | \$ 1,275,000 | | | | | | \$ 1,275,000 | | |
| STC 11100 | Preservation 124th Ave 132nd St to 144th St | No - maintenance | No - maintenance | | | \$ 2,915,517 | | | | \$ 2,915,517 | | |
| STC 99990 | Regional Inter-Agency Coordination | No - not capacity | No - not capacity | \$ 682,000 | \$ 82,000 | \$ 82,000 | \$ 82,000 | \$ 82,000 | \$ 82,000 | \$ 1,092,000 | \$ 574,000 | |
| NMC 00621 | Street Levy - Neighborhood Safety Program Improvements | No - safety | No - safety | \$ 550,000 | \$ 350,000 | \$ 150,000 | \$ 150,000 | \$ 150,000 | \$ 150,000 | \$ 1,500,000 | \$ 1,050,000 | |
| NMC 05700 | Annual Sidewalk Maintenance Program | No - maintenance | No - maintenance | \$ 100,000 | | | | | | \$ 100,000 | \$ 700,000 | |
| NMC 08720 | NE 131st Way/90th Ave NE Nonmotorized Impr. (97th Ave NE to NE 134th St) Scope & Design | No | No | \$ 330,000 | | | | | | \$ 330,000 | | |
| NMC 09010 | Juanita Drive Multi-Modal | Yes | Yes | | \$ 264,000 | | | | | \$ 264,000 | | |
| NMC 10100 | 7th Ave/NE 87th St Complete Street Improvements (SAP Scopes 10, P1, P3) | Yes | Yes | | | \$ 1,794,501 | | | \$ 7,788,676 | \$ 9,583,177 | | |
| NMC 11010 | Citywide Accessibility Improvements | No - not capacity | No - not capacity | \$ 50,000 | \$ 100,000 | \$ 50,000 | \$ 100,000 | \$ 50,000 | \$ 100,000 | \$ 450,000 | \$ 500,000 | |
| NMC 11300 | Stores to Shores | Yes NM2 | Yes | \$ 2,251,400 | | | | | | \$ 2,251,400 | | |
| NMC 12900 | Pedestrian Safety Improvements (Downtown & NE 124th Street) | No - safety | No - safety | \$ 217,800 | | | | | | \$ 217,800 | | |
| NMC 13100 | 116th Ave NE Crosswalk Improvements at Kingsgate Park and Ride | Yes | Yes | \$ 200,000 | | | | | | \$ 200,000 | | |
| NMC 13200 | Trail Connection at Juanita Drive and NE 132nd St | No - trail | Yes | | | | \$ 855,000 | | | \$ 855,000 | | |
| NMC 13400 | NE 128th St Nonmotorized Improvements - 116th Ave to 120th Ave | Yes | Yes | | | \$ 1,035,000 | | | | \$ 1,035,000 | | |
| NMC 13500 | NE 124th St Slater Ave Crossing Improvements | Yes | Yes | \$ 150,000 | | | | | | \$ 150,000 | | |
| NMC 13600 | NE 132nd St Slater Ave Crossing Improvements | Yes | Yes | \$ 1,550,000 | \$ 567,000 | \$ 372,000 | | \$ 714,000 | | \$ 3,203,000 | | |
| NMC 13700 | Willows Road at East Trail Nonmotorized Improvements | Yes | Yes | \$ 230,000 | | | | | | \$ 230,000 | | |
| NMC 13800 | State St at 7th Ave Crosswalk Improvements | No | No | | \$ 165,000 | | | | | \$ 165,000 | | |
| NMC 13900 | 116th Ave NE Sidewalk Improvements - 73rd St to 75th Pl | Yes | Yes | | | \$ 646,875 | | | | \$ 646,875 | | |
| NMC 14200 | I-405/NE 85th St Shared Use Trails to 116th Ave NE (SAP Scope 13A) | No - trail | No - replaces existing trail | | | | | \$ 3,997,664 | | \$ 3,997,664 | | |
| NMC 14300 | 85th St Enhanced Sidewalks & Multilane Paths: I-405 to 120th Ave NE (SAP Scope 18A) | Yes | Yes | | | \$ 3,148,759 | | | | \$ 3,148,759 | | |
| NMC 14400 | 85th Multimodal Improvements (SAP Scopes 18B, 18C, P2) | Yes | Yes | | | | | | \$ 7,253,699 | \$ 7,253,699 | | |
| NMC 14500 | 116th Ped/Bike Access to I-405 Overcrossing (SAP Scope 19) | Yes | Yes | | | \$ 466,483 | | | | \$ 466,483 | | |
| NMC 30000 | Transportation Benefit District Implementation | Yes NM4* | Yes | \$ 1,675,000 | \$ 23,286,000 | \$ 650,000 | \$ 650,000 | \$ 650,000 | \$ 650,000 | \$ 27,561,000 | | |
| NMC 14700 | I-405/NE 85th St Shared Use Trails (SE Corner) to NE 80th St (SAP Scope 13C) | No - trail | Yes | | | \$ 3,644,397 | | | | \$ 3,644,397 | | |
| NMC 14800 | Lee Johnson South: NE 80th St/118th Ave NE (SAP Scope 2) | No - not capacity | No - not capacity | | | \$ 2,271,188 | | | | \$ 2,271,188 | | |
| TRC 09800 | NE 132nd St/116th Way NE (I-405) Intersection Improvements | Yes | Yes | \$ 1,270,000 | | | | | | \$ 1,270,000 | | |
| TRC 11600 | Annual Signal Maintenance Program | No - maintenance | No - safety | \$ 100,000 | \$ 100,000 | \$ 100,000 | \$ 100,000 | \$ 100,000 | \$ 100,000 | \$ 600,000 | \$ 700,000 | |
| TRC 11700 | Citywide Traffic Management Safety Improvements | No - safety | No - safety | \$ 100,000 | | \$ 100,000 | | \$ 100,000 | | \$ 300,000 | \$ 300,000 | |
| TRC 11702 | Vision Zero Safety Improvement | No - safety | No - safety | \$ 750,000 | \$ 100,000 | \$ 50,000 | \$ 50,000 | \$ 50,000 | \$ 50,000 | \$ 1,050,000 | \$ 300,000 | |
| TRC 11703 | Neighborhood Traffic Control | No - not capacity | No - safety | \$ 50,000 | \$ 50,000 | \$ 50,000 | \$ 50,000 | \$ 50,000 | \$ 50,000 | \$ 300,000 | \$ 150,000 | |
| TRC 12000 | Kirkland Intelligent Transportation System Phase 3 | Yes R19, R20 | Yes | \$ 244,100 | \$ 1,463,455 | | \$ 312,893 | \$ 389,552 | | \$ 2,410,000 | | |
| TRC 13000 ^^ | NE 145th Street/Juanita-Woodinville Way Intersection Imps | No - maintenance | No - maintenance | | | | \$ 1,040,000 | \$ 1,911,961 | | \$ 2,951,961 | | |
| TRC 13100 ^^ | NE 80th Street/120th Avenue NE Intersection Improvements (SAP Scope 3) | Yes | Yes | | | | | \$ 2,509,471 | | \$ 2,509,471 | | |
| TRC 13500 | 100th Avenue NE/Simonds Rd Intersection Improvements | Yes R10 | Yes | \$ 639,520 | | | | | | \$ 639,520 | | |
| TRC 13600 | 100th Avenue NE/NE 145th St Intersection Improvements | Yes | Yes | \$ 648,519 | | | | | | \$ 648,519 | | |
| TRC 13700 | Kirkland Ave/Lake St Intersection | Yes | Yes | \$ 1,172,230 | | | | | | \$ 1,172,230 | | |
| TRC 13800 ^^ | NE 100th Street/132nd Ave NE Intersection Improvements | Yes R10 | Yes | \$ 600,000 | \$ 2,533,000 | | | | | \$ 3,133,000 | | |
| TRC 13900 | 85th St/132nd Ave NE Dual Left Turn Lanes - Design | Yes | Yes | | | | \$ 1,007,555 | | | \$ 1,007,555 | | |
| TRC 14200* | 122nd Avenue NE at NE 70th Street Intersection Improvements | No - safety | No - safety | | | | | \$ 1,951,961 | \$ 1,000,000 | \$ 2,951,961 | | |
| TRC 14300* | NE 85th Street (I-405) Intersection Improvements | Yes | Yes | \$ 373,000 | | | | | | \$ 373,000 | | |
| TRC 14400* | Modifications to 85th/120th Intersection (SAP Scope 5A) | Yes | Yes | | | \$ 2,565,655 | | | | \$ 2,565,655 | | |
| TRC 14500* | Lee Johnson East: NE 83rd St/120th Ave NE Signalized Access (SAP Scope 1) | No - not capacity | No - not capacity | | | \$ 2,696,854 | | | | \$ 2,696,854 | | |
| TRC 14600 | NE 112th St & 80th Ave NE & Juanita Dr NE Intersection Improvements | Yes R12 | Yes | | | \$ 1,900,000 | | | | \$ 1,900,000 | | |
| PTC 00400 | 108th Avenue NE Transit Queue Jump - Phase I | Yes | Yes | \$ 100,000 | \$ 219,000 | \$ 805,000 | \$ 3,000,000 | | | \$ 4,124,000 | | |
| PTC 00500 | 108th Avenue NE Transit Queue Jump - Phase II | Yes | Yes | \$ 100,000 | \$ 119,000 | \$ 905,000 | \$ 4,000,000 | | | \$ 5,124,000 | | |
| Subtotal 2023-2035 | | | | \$ 39,754,295 | \$ 37,306,995 | \$ 32,728,228 | \$ 16,599,448 | \$ 17,983,609 | \$ 22,578,375 | \$ 166,950,950 | | |

| Transportation Capital Facilities Plan 2023-2035 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|--|--------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|---------------|------|------|------|------|------|--|------------------------|--|
| CIP Project Number | Project Title | Included in Impact Fee calculation? | Capacity project for concurrency? | Funded in CIP | | | | | | Six-Year Funded CIP 2023-2028 | 2029-2035 CIP Projects | Candidate Projects for Unanticipated Revenue |
| | | | | 2023 | 2024 | 2025 | 2026 | 2027 | 2028 | | | |
| STC 06300 | 120th Avenue NE Roadway Improvements (north) | Yes R18* | Yes | | | | | | | | \$ 4,500,000 | |
| STC 07200 | NE 120th St Roadway Improvements | Yes R25 | Yes | | | | | | | | \$ 15,780,600 | |
| STC 07700 | NE 132nd St Rdwy Imprv.-Phase I (West Section) | Yes R1 | Yes | | | | | | | | \$ 1,739,000 | |
| STC 07800 | NE 132nd St Rdwy Imprv-Phase II (Mid Section) | Yes R2 | Yes | | | | | | | | \$ 408,000 | |
| STC 07900 | NE 132nd St Rdwy Imprv-Phase III (East Section) | Yes R3 | Yes | | | | | | | | \$ 1,444,000 | |
| STC 08100 | Totem Lake Area Development Opportunity Program | Yes* | Yes | | | | | | | | \$ 500,000 | |
| STC 08315 | 100th Avenue NE Roadway Improvements (Mid-South Section) | Yes R10 | Yes | | | | | | | | \$ 5,530,000 | |
| STC 08316 | 100th Avenue NE Roadway Improvements (South Section) | Yes R10 | Yes | | | | | | | | \$ 3,619,000 | |
| STC 09400 | Holmes Point Dr NE Road Embankment Stabilization Location 1 | No - maintenance | No - maintenance | | | | | | | | \$ 246,000 | |
| STC 09500 | Holmes Point Dr NE Road Embankment Stabilization Location 2 | No - maintenance | No - maintenance | | | | | | | | \$ 412,000 | |
| STC 09600 | Holmes Point Dr NE Road Embankment Stabilization Location 3 | No - maintenance | No - maintenance | | | | | | | | \$ 503,000 | |
| STC 09700 | Holmes Point Dr NE Road Embankment Stabilization Location 4 | No - maintenance | No - maintenance | | | | | | | | \$ 551,000 | |
| STC 09800 | Holmes Point Dr NE Road Embankment Stabilization Location 5 | No - maintenance | No - maintenance | | | | | | | | \$ 232,000 | |
| STC 09900 | Champagne Pt Road NE Embankment Stabilization | No - maintenance | No - maintenance | | | | | | | | \$ 563,000 | |
| STC 10000 | 62nd Ave NE Road Embankment Stabilization | No - maintenance | No - maintenance | | | | | | | | \$ 823,000 | |
| STC 10100 | 114th Ave NE Road Reconstruction | No - maintenance | No - maintenance | | | | | | | | \$ 1,900,000 | |
| STC 10200 | 90th Ave NE Road Surface Water Drainage Repair | No - maintenance | No - maintenance | | | | | | | | \$ 420,000 | |
| STC 11200* | 124th Ave NE Roadway Widening: NE 85th St to NE 90th St. | No - Tax Increment Financing Project | Yes | | | | | | | | \$ 23,682,000 | |
| PTC 00200 | Public Transit Speed and Reliability Improvements | Yes T1 | Yes | | | | | | | | \$ 500,000 | |
| PTC 00300 | Public Transit Passenger Environment Improvements | Yes T2 | Yes | | | | | | | | \$ 500,000 | |
| TRC 09500 | NE 132nd St/Fire Stn Access Dr Intersect'n Imp | Yes R6 | Yes | | | | | | | | \$ 480,000 | |
| TRC 09600 | NE 132nd St/124th Ave NE Intersect'n Imp | Yes R7 | Yes | | | | | | | | \$ 7,400,000 | |
| TRC 09700 | NE 132nd St/132nd Ave NE Intersect'n Imp | Yes R8 | Yes | | | | | | | | \$ 1,150,000 | |
| TRC 12500 | Kirkland ITS Implementation Phase 4 | Yes R19, R20 | Yes | | | | | | | | \$ 2,620,000 | |
| TRC 12800 ^ | 6th Street S/5th Place/CCK Transit Signal Priority | Yes | Yes | | | | | | | | \$ 2,600,000 | |
| TRC 12900 ^ | NE 53rd Street Intersection Improvements | Yes | Yes | | | | | | | | \$ 4,345,000 | |
| TRC 13200 ^ | 100th Avenue NE/132nd Street Intersection Improvements | Yes R10 | Yes | | | | | | | | \$ 1,647,000 | |
| TRC 13300 ^^ | 100th Avenue NE/Juanita-Woodinville Way Intersection Imps | Yes R10 | Yes | | | | | | | | \$ 2,161,000 | |
| TRC 13400 ^^ | 100th Avenue NE/137th Street Intersection Improvements | Yes R10 | Yes | | | | | | | | \$ 1,475,000 | |
| NMC 01299 | Crosswalk Upgrade Program | Yes NM5* | Yes | | | | | | | | \$ 4,100,000 | |
| NMC 02600* | NE 90th Street Complete Street and Greenway | Yes? SAP candidate | Yes | | | | | | | | \$ 13,478,000 | |
| NMC 08630 | CCK Roadway Crossings | Yes NM3 | Yes | | | | | | | | \$ 3,370,100 | |
| NMC 08740* | NE 134th St Sidewalk from 88th Pl to 87th Ave NE | No | No | | | | | | | | \$ 600,000 | |
| NMC 08750* | Ped Crossing at Lake Washington Institute of Technology | No | No | | | | | | | | \$ 850,000 | |
| NMC 09011 | Juanita Drive Bicycle and Pedestrian Improvements | Yes NM1, NM4 | Yes | | | | | | | | \$ 10,650,000 | |
| NMC 10500* | 120th Avenue NE Improvements (85th St to 90th St) | Yes? SAP candidate | Yes | | | | | | | | \$ 874,000 | |
| NMC 11100 ^ | 108th Avenue NE Bicycle Lane Upgrades | Yes | Yes | | | | | | | | \$ 845,000 | |
| NMC 11399 | Citywide Greenway Network | Yes NM2 | Yes | | | | | | | | \$ 4,450,000 | |
| NMC 11700 | On-Street Bicycle Network Phase I | Yes NM1 | Yes | | | | | | | | \$ 1,120,000 | |
| NMC 12700 | Juanita Drive Nonmotorized Improvements 79th Way NE to NE 120th St | No | No | | | | | | | | \$ 680,000 | |
| NMC 15000* | 122nd Ave NE Bike Route (NE 80th St to NE 90th St) | Yes? SAP candidate | Yes | | | | | | | | \$ 4,290,000 | |
| NMC 15100* | Shared Use Path (NE 120th Ave to NE 122nd Ave) at 83rd Street | No - trail? | Yes? | | | | | | | | \$ 1,105,000 | |
| NMC 15200* | NE 85th St Enhanced Sidewalks: 124th Ave NE to 126th Ave NE | Yes | Yes | | | | | | | | \$ 4,401,000 | |
| NMC 15300* | NE 85th St Enhanced Sidewalks: 126th Ave NE to 128th Ave NE | Yes | Yes | | | | | | | | \$ 5,661,000 | |
| NMC 15700* | NE 80th Street / 122nd Ave NE Intersection RRFB | Yes? SAP candidate | Yes | | | | | | | | \$ 795,000 | |
| NM 88881 | On-street Bicycle Network | Yes NM1 | Yes | | | | | | | | \$ 3,280,000 | |
| NM 99991 | Sidewalk Completion Program | Yes NM4* | Yes | | | | | | | | \$ 6,096,800 | |
| | | | | | | | | | | FUTURE YEAR TOTAL | \$ 198,471,500 | |
| | | | | | | | | | | FUNDED TOTAL + UNFUNDED = 20 YEAR TOTAL | \$ 365,422,450 | |
| NMC 02421 | Cross Kirkland Corridor Opportunity Fund | No | No | | | | | | | | | \$ 500,000 |
| NMC 03100 | Crestwoods Park/CCK Corridor Ped/Bike Facility | No | No | | | | | | | | | \$ 2,505,000 |
| NMC 08000 | Juanita-Kingsgate Pedestrian Bridge at I-405 | No | No | | | | | | | | | \$ 4,500,000 |
| NMC 10600 | Citywide CCK Connections | No | No | | | | | | | | | \$ 360,000 |
| NMC 10700 | CCK to Downtown Surface Connection | No | No | | | | | | | | | \$ 2,000,000 |
| | | | | | | | | | | CANDIDATE TOTAL | \$ 9,865,000 | |

Proportioned over four new separate projects from one original single roadway improvement (1,066 trips)

* Depending on project scope; see Rate Study and Transportation Master Plan.

^ New for 2017-2022 CFP Update not previously counted; to be counted in future Rate Study

^^ New for 2019-2024 CFP Update not previously counted; to be counted in future Rate Study

* New for 2023-2028 CFP Update not previously counted; to be counted in future Rate Study

Table CF - 6
Capital Facilities Plan: Utility Projects

(Updated 11-30-23)

SOURCE OF FUNDS

| <i>Revenue Type</i> | <i>Revenue Source</i> | <i>2023</i> | <i>2024</i> | <i>2025</i> | <i>2026</i> | <i>2027</i> | <i>2028</i> | <i>Six-Year Total</i> |
|----------------------|---|-------------------|-------------------|------------------|-------------------|-------------------|------------------|-----------------------|
| Local | Utility Rates | 5,078,000 | 5,401,000 | 5,604,000 | 5,858,000 | 2,762,625 | - | 24,703,625 |
| Local | Connection Fees | 1,303,000 | 1,316,000 | 1,330,000 | 1,343,000 | 1,356,000 | - | 6,648,000 |
| Local | Reserves | 4,574,535 | 3,348,015 | 1,611,000 | - | - | - | 9,533,550 |
| Local | Funded Through NE 85th Station Area Plan Mechanisms | - | - | - | 4,800,000 | 11,304,720 | - | 16,104,720 |
| External | Secured External | 1,318,000 | - | - | - | - | - | 1,318,000 |
| Local | Intrafund Project Transfer | 2,682,000 | - | - | - | - | - | 2,682,000 |
| Local | Debt | - | - | - | - | 4,000,000 | 4,000,000 | 8,000,000 |
| Total Sources | | 14,955,535 | 10,065,015 | 8,545,000 | 12,001,000 | 19,423,345 | 4,000,000 | 68,989,895 |

USES OF FUNDS

Funded Projects

| <i>Project Number</i> | <i>Project Title</i> | <i>2023</i> | <i>2024</i> | <i>2025</i> | <i>2026</i> | <i>2027</i> | <i>2028</i> | <i>Six-Year Total</i> |
|--------------------------------------|--|-------------------|-------------------|------------------|-------------------|-------------------|------------------|-----------------------|
| WAC 05700 | 116th Ave NE Watermain Replacement | - | - | - | 454,374 | 2,728,206 | - | 3,182,580 |
| WAC 12900 | South Reservoir Seismic & Recoating Construction | 6,300,000 | - | - | - | - | - | 6,300,000 |
| WAC 13400 | 5th Avenue S/8th Street S Watermain Replacement | 125,106 | - | - | - | - | - | 125,106 |
| WAC 13700 | NE 73rd Street Watermain Replacement | 855,485 | 2,709,515 | - | - | - | - | 3,565,000 |
| WAC 14900 | Lake Washington Blvd Watermain Replacement | - | - | 600,000 | 1,819,226 | - | - | 2,419,226 |
| WAC 15700 | 8th Avenue W Watermain Improvement | 721,964 | - | - | - | - | - | 721,964 |
| WAC 16000 | 126th Avenue NE Watermain Improvement | 400,000 | - | - | - | - | - | 400,000 |
| WAC 16400 | NE 116th Place Watermain Replacement | - | - | - | - | 241,569 | - | 241,569 |
| WAC 16700 | 11th Avenue Watermain Replacement | - | - | - | - | 476,100 | - | 476,100 |
| WAC 16800 | 11th Place Watermain Replacement | - | - | - | - | 672,750 | - | 672,750 |
| WAC 17000 | 122nd Ave at NE 85th St Waterline Improvement | 150,000 | - | - | - | - | - | 150,000 |
| SSC 00600 | Trend Lift Station | 550,000 | 1,680,600 | - | - | - | - | 2,230,600 |
| SSC 06200 | NE 108th Street Sewermain Replacement | - | 2,862,400 | 3,526,100 | 1,354,000 | - | - | 7,742,500 |
| SSC 07710 | West of Market Sewermain Replacement - Phase 1 | 4,317,600 | 2,812,500 | 3,069,900 | - | - | - | 10,200,000 |
| SSC 07799 | West of Market Sewermain Replacement - Phase 2 | - | - | - | - | 4,000,000 | 4,000,000 | 8,000,000 |
| SSC 08600 | 8th Avenue W Sewermain Improvement | 1,518,000 | - | - | - | - | - | 1,518,000 |
| SSC 08800 | Houghton Sewerline at Fire Station 22 | 17,380 | - | - | - | - | - | 17,380 |
| SSC 08900 | NE 85th St and I-405 Sewermain Capacity Enhancements | - | - | - | 4,800,000 | 11,304,720 | - | 16,104,720 |
| SSC 09000 | Lake Washington Blvd Sewermain Replacement | - | - | 1,349,000 | 3,573,400 | - | - | 4,922,400 |
| Total Funded Utility Projects | | 14,955,535 | 10,065,015 | 8,545,000 | 12,001,000 | 19,423,345 | 4,000,000 | 68,989,895 |

| | | | | | | | | |
|---------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| SURPLUS (DEFICIT) of Resources | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
|---------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

Table CF - 7
Capital Facilities Plan: Surface Water Utility Projects

(Updated 11-30-23)

SOURCES OF FUNDS

| <i>Revenue Type</i> | <i>Revenue Source</i> | <i>2023</i> | <i>2024</i> | <i>2025</i> | <i>2026</i> | <i>2027</i> | <i>2028</i> | <i>Six-Year Total</i> |
|----------------------|-----------------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|-----------------------|
| Local | Utility Rates | 2,820,000 | 2,887,000 | 2,953,000 | 3,017,000 | 3,118,000 | 2,998,335 | 17,793,335 |
| Local | Utility Reserves | 209,500 | 609,400 | | | | | 818,900 |
| Local | Intrafund Project Transfers | 96,106 | | | | | | 96,106 |
| Local | Real Estate Excise Tax | 230,000 | | | | | | 230,000 |
| External | Secured Grant | 881,991 | | | | | | 881,991 |
| External | Unsecured External | | | 450,000 | 873,750 | | | 1,323,750 |
| External | Unsecured Developer | | 500,000 | | | | | 500,000 |
| Total Sources | | 4,237,597 | 3,996,400 | 3,403,000 | 3,890,750 | 3,118,000 | 2,998,335 | 21,644,082 |

USES OF FUNDS

Funded Projects

| <i>Project Number</i> | <i>Project Title</i> | <i>2023</i> | <i>2024</i> | <i>2025</i> | <i>2026</i> | <i>2027</i> | <i>2028</i> | <i>Six-Year Total</i> |
|--|--|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|-----------------------|
| SDC 04700 | Annual Replacement of Aging/Failing Infrastructure | 896,106 | 500,000 | 500,000 | 500,000 | 500,000 | 500,000 | 3,396,106 |
| SDC 08100 | Neighborhood Drainage Assistance Program (NDA) | 50,000 | | 50,000 | | 50,000 | | 150,000 |
| SDC 08315 | 100th Ave Water Quality Improvements | 384,000 | | | | | | 384,000 |
| SDC 08900 | NE 142nd Street Surface Water Drainage Improvements | 338,200 | | | | | | 338,200 |
| SDC 09000 | Goat Hill Drainage Ditch Conveyance & Channel Stabilization | 500,000 | 500,000 | | | | | 1,000,000 |
| SDC 09200 | Juanita Creek Culvert at NE 137th Street | | | 761,852 | 2,202,273 | | | 2,964,125 |
| SDC 10100 | Holmes Point Pipe Replacement at Champagne Creek Basin | | | 450,000 | 873,750 | | | 1,323,750 |
| SDC 10500 | Property Acquisition Opportunity Fund | 50,000 | 50,000 | 50,000 | 50,000 | 50,000 | 50,000 | 300,000 |
| SDC 10700 | 132nd Sq Park Surface Water Improvements | 330,466 | | | | | | 330,466 |
| SDC 11600 | NE 140th Street Pipe Replacement | | | | | | 977,357 | 977,357 |
| SDC 12300 | Lake Street Surface Water Repair | 25,000 | | | | | | 25,000 |
| SDC 12800 | NE 85th Street/122nd Avenue NE Stormwater Improvements | 147,800 | 591,200 | | | | | 739,000 |
| SDC 12900 | NE Juanita Drive Storm Failure Near 86th Avenue NE | 632,500 | | | | | | 632,500 |
| SDC 13200 | Water Quality Treatment and Infiltration at NE 111th Pl/127th Pl NE | 230,025 | | | | | | 230,025 |
| SDC 13300 | Bioretention, Water Quality Treatment, and Storage at 126th Ave NE - Phase 1 | 100,000 | | | | | | 100,000 |
| SDC 13900 | 122nd Avenue NE Storm Replacement | 388,500 | 604,000 | | | | | 992,500 |
| SDC 14100 | Storm Line Rehabilitation on NE 136th Street | | | | 264,727 | 2,127,339 | | 2,392,066 |
| SDC 14900 | NE 119th Court Storm System Improvement | | | 499,125 | | | | 499,125 |
| SDC 15100 | 83rd Ave NE and NE 110th Pl Intersection Pipe Replacement | 165,000 | | | | | | 165,000 |
| SDC 15600 | Holmes Point Drive NE Pipe Installation | | | | | 390,661 | 1,470,978 | 1,861,639 |
| SDC 15900 | 108th Avenue NE Pipe Installation | | | 1,092,023 | | | | 1,092,023 |
| SDC 16400 | Silver Spurs Storm System Upgrade | | 1,751,200 | | | | | 1,751,200 |
| Total Funded Surface Water Utility Projects | | 4,237,597 | 3,996,400 | 3,403,000 | 3,890,750 | 3,118,000 | 2,998,335 | 21,644,082 |

| | | | | | | | | |
|---------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| <i>SURPLUS (DEFICIT) of Resources</i> | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
|---------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

Table CF - 8
Capital Facilities Plan: Parks Projects

(Updated 11-30-23)

SOURCES OF FUNDS

| <i>Revenue Type</i> | <i>Revenue Source</i> | <i>2023</i> | <i>2024</i> | <i>2025</i> | <i>2026</i> | <i>2027</i> | <i>2028</i> | <i>Six-Year Total</i> |
|----------------------|--------------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|-----------------------|
| Local | Real Estate Excise Tax | 1,509,000 | 1,409,000 | 1,409,000 | 1,409,000 | 1,409,000 | 1,409,000 | 8,554,000 |
| Local | General Fund | 3,800,000 | - | - | - | - | - | 3,800,000 |
| Local | Reserves | 164,730 | 100,815 | 166,822 | 124,263 | 213,860 | 113,742 | 884,233 |
| Local | Kirkland Park Levy | 250,000 | 250,000 | 250,000 | 250,000 | 250,000 | 250,000 | 1,500,000 |
| Local | Impact Fees | 471,510 | 1,500,000 | 1,500,000 | 1,500,000 | 1,500,000 | 1,500,000 | 7,971,510 |
| Local | Project Balance Transfer | 359,368 | - | - | - | - | - | 359,368 |
| External | King County Park Levy | 365,000 | 365,000 | 365,000 | - | - | - | 1,095,000 |
| External | Secured Grants/External | 449,750 | 449,750 | 449,750 | 449,750 | - | - | 1,799,000 |
| Total Sources | | 7,369,358 | 4,074,565 | 4,140,572 | 3,733,013 | 3,372,860 | 3,272,742 | 25,963,111 |

USES OF FUNDS

Funded Projects

| <i>Project Number</i> | <i>Project Title</i> | <i>2023</i> | <i>2024</i> | <i>2025</i> | <i>2026</i> | <i>2027</i> | <i>2028</i> | <i>Six-Year Total</i> |
|------------------------------------|--|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|-----------------------|
| PKC 06600 | Park Playgrounds, Sport Courts & Amenity Repair, Replacement | 500,000 | 454,600 | 365,000 | 400,000 | 409,000 | 409,000 | 2,537,600 |
| PKC 12400 | Snyder's Corner Park Master Plan and Development | 128,000 | | | | | | 128,000 |
| PKC 13310 | Dock & Shoreline Renovations | 365,000 | 460,400 | 250,000 | 250,000 | 250,000 | 108,800 | 1,684,200 |
| PKC 13320 | City-School Playfield Partnership | | | | 300,000 | | 141,200 | 441,200 |
| PKC 13330 | Neighborhood Park Land Acquisition | 3,800,000 | 1,500,000 | 1,500,000 | 400,000 | 750,000 | 500,000 | 8,450,000 |
| PKC 13400 | 132nd Square Park Playfields | 300,000 | | | | | | 300,000 |
| PKC 15100 | Park Facilities Life Cycle Projects | 164,730 | 100,815 | 166,822 | 124,263 | 213,860 | 113,742 | 884,233 |
| PKC 15200 | O.O. Denny Park Improvements | 252,878 | | | | | | 252,878 |
| PKC 15500 | Green Loop Master Plan, Acquisitions, Easements | 449,750 | 449,750 | 449,750 | 449,750 | | | 1,799,000 |
| PKC 15600 | Park Restrooms Additions, Renovations & Replacement Program | 1,409,000 | 1,109,000 | 1,084,000 | | | | 3,602,000 |
| PKC 15700 | Neighborhood Park Development Program | | | | | 500,000 | 1,000,000 | 1,500,000 |
| PKC 15900 | Off Leash Dog Areas | | | | 800,000 | 250,000 | 500,000 | 1,550,000 |
| PKC 16100 | McAuliffe Park Sanitary Sewer | | | 325,000 | | | | 325,000 |
| PKC 16200 | Wayfinding and Park Signage Program Plan | | | | 509,000 | 500,000 | | 1,009,000 |
| PKC 17000 | ADA Compliance Upgrades | | | | 500,000 | 500,000 | 500,000 | 1,500,000 |
| Total Funded Parks Projects | | 7,369,358 | 4,074,565 | 4,140,572 | 3,733,013 | 3,372,860 | 3,272,742 | 25,963,111 |

| | | | | | | | | |
|---------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| <i>SURPLUS (DEFICIT) of Resources</i> | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
|---------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

(Updated 11-30-23)

| Revenue Type | Revenue Source | 2023 | 2024 | 2025 | 2026 | 2027 | 2028 | Six-Year Total |
|----------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|-------------------|
| Local | Fire Sinking Fund (General Fund) | 1,867,200 | 850,600 | 35,400 | 32,800 | 278,800 | 185,300 | 3,250,100 |
| Local | Police Sinking Fund (General Fund) | 201,900 | 129,800 | 223,100 | 220,700 | 134,300 | 289,000 | 1,198,800 |
| Local | General Fund Cash | 3,072,000 | | | | | | 3,072,000 |
| External | King County EMS Levy | 40,000 | | | | | | 40,000 |
| Local | Fire Station Project Transfers | 1,945,000 | | | | | | 1,945,000 |
| Local | Debt | 21,295,836 | | | - | - | - | 21,295,836 |
| Total Sources | | 28,421,936 | 980,400 | 258,500 | 253,500 | 413,100 | 474,300 | 30,801,736 |

| <i>Project Number</i> | <i>Project Title</i> | <i>2023</i> | <i>2024</i> | <i>2025</i> | <i>2026</i> | <i>2027</i> | <i>2028</i> | <i>Six-Year Total</i> |
|--|---|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-----------------------|
| PSC 05600 | Disaster Storage Units | | | | | | 162,200 | 162,200 |
| PSC 06200 | Defibrillator Unit Replacement | 202,100 | | | | | | 202,100 |
| PSC 06300 | Air Fill Station Replacement | | 82,500 | | | | | 82,500 |
| PSC 07100 | Self Contained Breathing Apparatus (SCBA) | 1,631,600 | | | | | | 1,631,600 |
| PSC 07600 | Personal Protective Equipment | 8,800 | 700,900 | 9,300 | 9,500 | 203,000 | 9,900 | 941,400 |
| PSC 08200 | Water Rescue Craft Storage & Lift | 40,000 | | | | | | 40,000 |
| PSC 20000 | Fire Equipment Replacement | 206,700 | 67,200 | 26,100 | 23,300 | 75,800 | 13,200 | 412,300 |
| <i>Subtotal Funded Fire Projects</i> | | 2,089,200 | 850,600 | 35,400 | 32,800 | 278,800 | 185,300 | 3,472,100 |
| PSC 10000 | Police Equipment Replacement | 288,900 | 129,800 | 223,100 | 220,700 | 134,300 | 289,000 | 1,285,800 |
| <i>Subtotal Funded Police Projects</i> | | 288,900 | 129,800 | 223,100 | 220,700 | 134,300 | 289,000 | 1,285,800 |
| PSC 30040 | Fire Station 21 Expansion & Remodel | 7,243,000 | | | | | | 7,243,000 |
| PSC 30050 | Fire Station 22 Expansion & Remodel | 2,138,404 | | | | | | 2,138,404 |
| PSC 30060 | Fire Station 26 Expansion & Remodel | 8,818,867 | | | | | | 8,818,867 |
| PSC 30070 | Fire Station 27 Replacement | 5,040,565 | | | | | | 5,040,565 |
| PSC 30090 | Fire Station 24 Training Capacity Configuration | 2,803,000 | | | | | | 2,803,000 |
| <i>Subtotal Funded Facility Projects</i> | | 26,043,836 | - | - | - | - | - | 26,043,836 |

| | | | | | | | |
|--|------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|------------|
| <i>Total Funded Public Safety Projects</i> | 28,421,936 | 980,400 | 258,500 | 253,500 | 413,100 | 474,300 | 30,801,736 |
|--|------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|------------|

| | | | | | | | |
|---------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| <i>SURPLUS (DEFICIT) of Resources</i> | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
|---------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

Table CF-10
Capital Facilities Plan: Facility Projects

(Updated 11-30-23)

SOURCES OF FUNDS

| <i>Revenue Type</i> | <i>Revenue Source</i> | <i>2023</i> | <i>2024</i> | <i>2025</i> | <i>2026</i> | <i>2027</i> | <i>2028</i> | <i>Six-Year Total</i> |
|-----------------------------|--------------------------------|-------------------|------------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|-----------------------|
| Local | Facilities Reserves | 1,470,465 | 922,300 | 384,800 | 557,300 | 11,600 | 223,100 | 3,569,565 |
| Local | Park Impact Fees | 1,500,000 | - | - | - | - | - | 1,500,000 |
| Local | Parks Project Transfer | 2,504,357 | - | - | - | - | - | 2,504,357 |
| Local | General Fund Cash | 6,285,000 | - | - | - | - | - | 6,285,000 |
| Local | Debt | 30,000 | - | - | - | - | - | 30,000 |
| Local | Other Reserves | 217,000 | - | - | - | - | - | 217,000 |
| Local | Stormwater Management Reserves | 612,000 | - | - | - | - | - | 612,000 |
| Local | REET 1 | 1,500,000 | 1,269,207 | - | - | - | - | 2,769,207 |
| Local | REET 2 | 750,000 | 750,000 | 550,000 | 250,000 | 250,000 | 250,000 | 2,800,000 |
| <i>Total Sources</i> | | 14,868,822 | 2,941,507 | 934,800 | 807,300 | 261,600 | 473,100 | 20,287,129 |

USES OF FUNDS

Funded Projects

| <i>Project Number</i> | <i>Project Title</i> | <i>2023</i> | <i>2024</i> | <i>2025</i> | <i>2026</i> | <i>2027</i> | <i>2028</i> | <i>Six-Year Total</i> |
|--|---|-------------------|------------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|-----------------------|
| GGC 08000 | Electrical, Energy Management & Lighting Systems | 28,400 | 152,600 | 23,400 | 170,000 | | 51,400 | 425,800 |
| GGC 09000 | Mechanical/HVAC Systems Replacements | 106,800 | 299,400 | 141,700 | 51,000 | 4,100 | 107,700 | 710,700 |
| GGC 09002 | PMO HVAC Replacement | 600,000 | | | | | | 600,000 |
| GGC 10000 | Painting, Ceilings, Partition & Window Replacements | 140,800 | 292,200 | 57,000 | 178,900 | 7,500 | 64,000 | 740,400 |
| GGC 11000 | Roofing, Gutter, Siding and Deck Replacements | 37,100 | 20,200 | 8,000 | 7,400 | | | 72,700 |
| GGC 12000 | Flooring Replacements | 22,700 | 157,900 | 154,700 | 150,000 | | | 485,300 |
| GGC 13000 | Permanent Supportive Housing | 500,000 | 300,000 | 300,000 | | | | 1,100,000 |
| GGC 15000 | Houghton Village Capital Improvements | 800,000 | | | | | | 800,000 |
| GGC 16000 | Kirkland Heights Apts - ARCH Trust Fund Project in Kirkland | 250,000 | 250,000 | 250,000 | 250,000 | 250,000 | 250,000 | 1,500,000 |
| GGC 17000 | Kirkland Performance Center Theatrical Rigging | | | | | | | |
| GGC 18000 | Houghton Park & Ride Purchase | 10,000,000 | 1,184,207 | | | | | 11,184,207 |
| GGC 19000 | City Hall Space Densification Pilot | 586,594 | | | | | | 586,594 |
| GGC 20000 | 6th Street Property Acquisition | 804,357 | | | | | | 804,357 |
| GGC 21000 | Kirkland Performance Center HVAC Replacement | | 85,000 | | | | | 85,000 |
| GGC 23000 | EV Charging Infrastructure Opportunity Fund | | 200,000 | | | | | 200,000 |
| GGC 05300 | Houghton Village Temp Fire Station Tenant Improvements | 42,071 | | | | | | 42,071 |
| GGC 05400 | PW Maintenance Center Upgrades | 500,000 | | | | | | 500,000 |
| GGC 05500 | PW MC Salt And Sand Storage | 200,000 | | | | | | 200,000 |
| GGC 05600 | PW MC Fire Panels | 250,000 | | | | | | 250,000 |
| <i>Total Funded Facility Projects</i> | | 14,868,822 | 2,941,507 | 934,800 | 807,300 | 261,600 | 473,100 | 20,287,129 |

| | | | | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| <i>SURPLUS (DEFICIT) of Resources</i> | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|